

faithfully accounted for. The books are open and we invite and court inspection.

But how is it under Republican rule at Washington? There the postoffice, the land office and other great departments are permeated with confessed corruption and fraud, which the Republican party dares not even allow a friendly congress to investigate for fear of the damaging revelations which would certainly follow.

The last report of the treasurer of the State shows that more than 75 per cent. of the State's entire income goes to pay three general items, to wit: Charitable and educational institutions, interest on the State debt and the sinking fund, and less than 20 per cent. is expended in maintaining the whole judicial, legislative and executive departments of the government, while only 2 1/2 per cent of its income is spent for salaries outside of the judiciary. Excluding the sinking fund, it costs less than \$1 per capita to run the State government, while under the present profligate and wasteful administration of the Republican party it costs \$9.40 per capita to run the national government. This illustrates the difference between old-fashioned Democratic honesty and economy and Republican extravagance and dishonesty.

Mr. Roosevelt's administration is the most extravagant, wasteful and corrupt that ever afflicted the American people in their more than a century and a quarter of existence as a nation. It costs more than double the money to carry on the government now than it did during the last Democratic administration. It cost to run the government in 1896, the last year of Cleveland's administration, \$352,000,000, or \$1.65 per capita. It cost last year under Roosevelt \$753,058,506, or \$9.40 for every man, woman and child in the United States. How much of this vast sum wrung from the people by taxation, for every dollar that finds its way into the national treasury is paid by the labor and toll and sweat of some American citizen, is annually squandered and stolen we can only guess from what we know of the rottenness of the postoffice and other departments. The taxpayers of America are entitled to an honest and an economical government. They are not getting either under Republican rule. The time has come, my fellow citizens, when the rascals should be turned out and the books overhauled.

But my competitor complains that there was on July 1 last a surplus of \$1,290,000 in the state treasury, wrong, as he says, from the people by taxation and deposited in favored banks over the state. The gentleman does not appear to know the difference between a surplus and a balance. A balance is what is on hand at a given time, subject to be paid out on the current obligations of the state. A surplus is the amount on hand, over and above all outstanding obligations. Only a few years ago Candidate Fowler and Candidate McCall of the Republican party were criticizing the Democratic party for not having a surplus. This year Candidate Littleton is criticizing it because it has a surplus. If the treasury is empty they want it full; if it is full they want it empty. There is really only one way to satisfy a Republican politician, and that is to give him free and unlimited access to the pie counter.

As everybody knows, under our system in Tennessee, most of the taxes are collected in the first part of the year and the balance then on hand must be enough to run through to the end of the year or there will be a deficit. Against the balance in the treasury on the 1st of July comes the current expenses, which from then on greatly exceed the collections; the semi-annual interest on the public debt and the semi-annual interest on the school fund, the sinking fund, and at the end of the year the surplus to be turned into the school fund. To do as my competitor advocates, and leave this \$1,290,000 uncollected and in the pockets of the taxpayers would force the state to repudiate its debts, default on its interest, lose its credit and become a borrower to pay its current obligations. I leave you to say whether a man who advocates such a financial policy would be a safe and prudent man to place at the head of your state government.

Let me tell you where this balance which he talks so much about comes from. It does not come out of the pockets of the masses of the taxpayers, the farmers and producers of Tennessee, but from the great corporations and the earnings of the penitentiary. During the last Republican administration in Tennessee, in 1881 and 1882, there was collected from the railroads, telegraphs and other corporations and the penitentiary \$164,498.33. During the last two years, under Democratic administration, there was collected from these same corporations and the penitentiary \$1,300,117.07, or just about the healthy balance that was in the treasury on the first day of July last. This balance was placed there by the care and the economy and the sound business methods of the Democratic party, and without raising the taxes one penny upon the farmers and laborers and producers of the state.

But my competitor tears his hair because he says this money is deposited in pet banks over the state and loaned out to the people at 10 to 16 per cent. Nearly two-thirds of the banks of the state are depositories, and any bank can become such by giving the required bond. This money is left in the banks in the counties where paid in until needed to meet the obligations of the State.

But what of the record of the Republican party on this subject? The last statement made by the secretary

of the national treasury showed that there was \$112,000,000 wrong from the people by unjust and unequal taxation, then on deposit in the banks of the country. How is that vast sum distributed, and who has the benefits and the profits from it without interest? The last report which I have seen shows that the great Republican states of the North are enjoying the bulk of it; that Wall street and the money centers of the East are reveling in its undisturbed possession. The state of New York alone has \$42,000,000, Pennsylvania has \$14,000,000,000, while the Democratic State of Tennessee, which pays from \$12,000,000 to \$14,000,000 a year taxes to the national government, is only allowed \$1,000,000. Talk about favored banks! Why, my fellow-citizens, there is one bank in New York, the National City Bank, which has \$12,000,000. Under Republican manipulation of the people's money one bank has loaned to it, without interest, twelve times as much as is loaned to the whole of the 2,250,000 people in Tennessee.

But that is not all. One of the favored banks in Tennessee about which my competitor complains, and in which is deposited a part of the balance in the state treasury, is the Bank of Winchester, and one of the stockholders and directors is the Hon. Jesse M. Littleton, of the county of Franklin. As a politician seeking office he criticizes the Democratic party and the treasurer for depositing money in his bank.

As a financier he says he loans that money to the people at the unlawful and usurious rate of 10 to 16 per cent interest. In the first instance he seeks to deceive and fool the people into voting for him out of prejudice against a surplus which does not exist, and in the second place he confesses that he violates the plain statute laws of his state in order to fleece from the people and put into his own pocket unjust and usurious interest.

When the Democratic party came into power in 1870 it found that during the Republican rule the old convict lease system had been established and was then in force in Tennessee. The Democratic party abolished that system and established the present system.

My competitor criticizes this splendid department and advocates abolishing the three commissioners who superintend it and look after its business affairs. Let us look to this for a moment.

When the Democratic party abolished the old convict lease system handed down to us by the Republican party it bought a splendid coal field, worth today more than five times its original cost; built a modern, well-equipped and up-to-date penitentiary, where the convicts are being humanely treated, without it costing the taxpayers of Tennessee one single dollar, as I propose to show from the records. Not only that, but by wise and judicious management, by economy and sound judgment, under the Democratic party, the penal system of the state is not only self-sustaining, but last year it paid every dollar for its maintenance and paid into the treasury \$135,000 in net profits, and for the first six months of this year the net profits were \$94,517.

When the present system was inaugurated \$600,000 of bonds were issued to buy the coal lands and build the new penitentiary. Since then the penitentiary has yielded in clear profits over \$800,000, or enough, if so applied, to have redeemed every bond issued and paid the interest thereon, thus giving to the State and the people the entire coal field and penitentiary, with its equipment, without their having cost them one cent. This property, which, under a policy inaugurated and perfected by the Democratic party, has come to the people of Tennessee without cost, is worth today more than \$1,000,000 in cash.

How was it under Republican rule in Tennessee? From 1865 to 1869, the penitentiary cost the taxpayers of Tennessee \$459,746, or an average loss of \$114,936 each year. Under Gov. Hawkins, in 1881-82, the last Republican administration in Tennessee, the penitentiary only yielded \$41,500 a year, while under Democratic management it yielded last year \$135,000. My fellow-citizens, thanks to Democratic statesmanship and fidelity, Tennessee has today the best penitentiary in any state in the Union, and it is making more clear money than any penitentiary in any state, and it is doing it without friction and without hurting any man in his labor or his business. And I leave it for you to say whether you are ready to turn it over to a Republican governor, who advocates a policy which would cripple and impair it, if it did not tear it down and destroy it.

My competitor declares himself against the Adams law. This he has a perfect right to do, but in order to do it and still be a candidate for governor, he had to remain discreetly silent on that law before the convention and repudiate his party's platform after the convention. That platform says:

"The Republican party is now and always has been in favor of temperance legislation. It will take no backward step upon this question. It approves of all existing laws restricting and throwing safeguards around the sale of liquor."

The Adams law is existing temperance legislation restricting the sale of liquor. My competitor was nominated on that platform, told the convention which nominated him that he stood on it, and yet in his opening speech he repudiates it and declares against it. If he stood on the platform when he accepted the nomination he was for the Adams law; if he was candid and honest with the people when he

made his Rutledge speech he was against the Adams law. When did he change, and why? Can either side or any honest man trust a candidate who is willing to shift his position in the hope of deceiving the people and getting votes? Does he think the platform of his party was written to hold the temperance Republican vote, and was his speech made to catch the Democratic anti-temperance vote. No, my countrymen, the gentleman must be either fish or fowl. He can not go through this campaign carrying water on one shoulder and liquor on the other. If he is against all existing temperance legislation when his party said it was for it, the people are entitled to know it. If he is against the Adams law, to be consistent he must, if elected, recommend its repeal. Will he do so? The people are entitled to know.

The honest Republicans who wrote and adopted that platform are entitled to know. Temperance sentiment and legislation in Tennessee has been the growth of years and has not been confined to any one party. The four-mile law was passed in 1877, and prohibited the sale of liquor except in incorporated towns. It was tried and its workings were approved by the people. In 1899, in obedience to an unmistakable popular demand, the four-mile law was extended and made to apply to towns of 2,000 population which might thereafter be incorporated, leaving the people of those towns to determine, by direct vote, or by the vote of their representatives if the legislature was in session, to either abolish their charters and make the law apply or not, as they pleased. This law stood and was tried for four years, and seemed to meet the approval of the people.

In 1903, in obedience to the sentiment of the people of all parties, as expressed in the votes of their representatives, this law was amended and extended to towns of 5,000 population, which might thereafter be incorporated, leaving it, as in the old law, for the people to abolish their charters and make the law apply, if they pleased, by direct vote, except when the legislature is in session, and then as their representative might be instructed by his constituency.

In the house sixty-nine Democrats voted for the bill and eleven against it, and twelve Republicans voted for it and none against it. In the senate fifteen Democrats voted for it and twelve against it, and five Republicans voted for it and none against it. I did not recommend that bill and had nothing to do with its passage, and while I have always been conservative and never an extremist upon these questions, and while I am not now and never was a prohibitionist, I signed and approved that bill in obedience to the will of my party and of the people of Tennessee without reference to party, and I have no apology to offer for it. I stand by the Adams law and am opposed to its repeal. I am in favor of giving it a fair and honest trial. When we have done this, if it proves to be a wise and beneficent law, all people will approve it. If it proves to be an unwise and an unjust law then the people can and will send their representatives so instructed, and the Democratic party will find a way to repeal it.

The platform of my party declares for this law. I am a Democrat, and I stand on that platform. If I could not conscientiously stand upon it, before I would repudiate or abandon it, or any plank of it, I would withdraw from the race and ask my party to place its banner in the hands of some other man, who believed in it and could honestly stand upon its platform. I would not have the office of governor if I had to get it by false promises and by repudiating the platform and principles which my party had written and upon which I was nominated.

If there be one Democrat here who does not approve of this legislation of his party, then I say to him, we cannot always get all we want in any party. But any Democrat can get more than he wants in Tennessee and in the nation through Democratic success than he can through Republican success. Let me say further, what can any Democrat who does not approve of this law hope for on this subject from the Republican party? That party cast its unanimous vote for the law on its passage; declared for it in its platform, and in the next legislature will stand with its few votes solid against its repeal, and the Republican candidate for governor is only wobbling on the gudgeon with the hope of fooling some good Democrats and getting enough of their votes to place the Republican party in power in Tennessee. My Democratic friends, beware. The Republican party is trying to sell you a gold brick.

But there is one charge made by my competitor in his opening speech, which I desire once for all to deny and to brand as a falsehood in every line and implication. I do not charge now that my competitor knew that it was false when he made it. I infer and believe that he did not, and that he made the charge from some idle rumor without an investigation to learn the truth. He said:

"It has been charged and never denied, that the whiskey men gave \$20,000 to the governor's campaign fund in 1902. Every vote he got cost the liquor people twenty cents a head."

That charge and every word and line of it is absolutely and unqualifiedly false. Every dollar contributed from every source to the Democratic campaign fund in that election did not amount to the half of \$20,000.

My competitor, like all his predecessors for the past ten years, expends his greatest eloquence in denouncing

the election laws. He raves and declaims and denounces and talks about liberties stolen and sacred rights trampled upon. He abuses the election commissioners and calls them thieves and perjurers, and so on ad nauseam, and finally winds up his tirade by admitting that he is himself one of these terrible election commissioners, who is subverting the liberties of the people, and that he approves and wants all of these laws to stand except the one requiring the governor to appoint a non-partisan election board for each county. Unable to furnish any reason why their party with its rotten record in the past should be again entrusted with power, and unable to find anything to lay hold upon or to justify criticism in the conduct of the State's affairs by the Democratic party, these Republicans bi-annually emit a lot of clap-trap and rot about the election laws, and try to persuade themselves that it is the election laws and not their own worthless policies and the bad record of their party that bring about their continuous defeat. They were defeated before we had these election laws, they have been defeated since, and as long as the people of Tennessee retain their senses and their self respect, they are going to be defeated. All of this ranting and protesting and declaiming is done for effect and to try to get some votes to help them into office. It is a twice-told tale. You have heard it before. Every honest man wants honest elections, but where a lot of politicians declaim so vehemently and so continuously against safeguards being thrown around the ballot box, and particularly when they are the leaders of a party which has stolen or tried to steal every office from president of the United States down to governor of Tennessee, it raises a suspicion in the mind of the average citizen that the reason these laws are so objectionable to the Republican politician, is not because they aid dishonesty anywhere, but because they prevent dishonesty in Republican East Tennessee.

Let us examine these laws coolly and dispassionately for a moment and see wherein they are defective. There are four of them. The secret ballot, or Dutch law, which applies to cities and towns of a certain population. The registration law, which requires the voter in towns and districts of a designated population to register every two years. The poll tax law, which requires the voter to pay poll tax for the support of the public schools and to help educate the poor children of the State before he can vote. And then the law requiring the governor to appoint three non-partisan election commissioners in each county to supervise the elections.

These laws and every one of them were passed in the interest of honest elections and to preserve the purity of the ballot box. As the country grew in population and that population drifted to the cities and great centers of business all parties recognized that greater safeguards should be thrown around the ballot box. And long before we felt the need of it, the great and populous States of the North and East, which were under the control of the Republican party, enacted laws providing for the secret ballot, registration, poll tax and other safeguards of the ballot. The Republican State of Massachusetts not only has the secret ballot and registration, but there no man can vote who has not paid not only his poll tax but all other taxes, and can read the constitution and write his name.

The secret ballot prevents bribery and intimidation. The voter goes into the booth alone, and there, away from the bribe giver and the bulldozer, he votes his honest convictions. Registration likewise prevents fraud and repeating. You do not need it in the country, where every voter is known and can be identified, but in the towns and cities, where there is a shifting, changing population, registration is the only means of identifying the voter and preventing fraud. Two of the great cities of the State, Memphis and Chattanooga, lie in the corner of three States, and before the passage of these laws it was no uncommon thing for hundreds of irresponsible negroes to be imported across the line and voted, and thus take from the people of these cities by fraud the right to control their affairs.

When these fair and just laws were proposed in Tennessee in 1885 the Republican party bitterly opposed them, and members of the legislature bolted and fled from the capitol to break a quorum and prevent their passage. They were passed by the Democratic party in the interest of good government and have been in force for nearly fifteen years, when lo and behold, in this year, 1904, the Republican candidate for governor rises up and approves them and says:

"Let the Dutch law stand—it provides for a secret ballot. Let the registration law stand—it prevents fraud. Let the poll tax alone—it brings money to the public treasury for public schools."

Verily, verily, light is beginning to dawn even upon the dark and benighted hosts of Republicanism.

This leaves only one law to which my competitor objects. It would be too much to expect him to approve them all, at least during this campaign. He wants to repeal the law requiring the governor to appoint a non-partisan election board for each county and to go back to the old system of allowing one man, a partisan sheriff, to appoint all the election officers in each county. Two years ago the Republican party in its platform opposed returning to the old plan of

allowing the sheriff to select all the election officers and declared itself in favor of an election board for the State, to be chosen by the senate upon the recommendation of the chairman of the State Republican and Democratic executive committees, who should appoint an election board in each county, who should appoint all election officers. This year they are in favor of going back to the old sheriff system. What they will advocate two years from now no power can foretell. It will doubtless be something which they think will give them some partisan advantage and not anything in the interest of honest government.

What were the causes which led to the adoption of the law? Under the old system one man had the power to name every judge and clerk and election officer in the county. That man was always a partisan, representing the majority in his county, and hence the minority had no representation and no voice in the selection of these officers. Under this one-man system frauds were easy and frequent, and in many counties in East Tennessee, where every officer was a Republican, they became notorious and scandalous. In the Turney-Evans contest, the undisputed proof showed that in many of these counties the poll tax and other laws were openly and willfully violated, and thousands of illegal and fraudulent ballots received and counted and the school children of the State robbed of their just dues. It was to meet and prevent just such wrongs as these and to give the minority representation on the board officers, that this law was passed. Under this law there is one Republican judge and one Republican clerk at each voting place, and it is difficult to see how fraud can be committed without their participation. There are some 1,800 voting places in the State, and when my competitor charges the wholesale stealing of elections in Tennessee, he not only slanders every Democratic election officer, but he slanders 3,600 sworn officials of his own party.

That this law has prevented fraud in East Tennessee is proven beyond the possibility of question, by the fact that in 1894 when Republican sheriffs held the elections, the Hon. H. Clay Evans, Republican candidate for governor, received, according to the face of the returns, 56,747 votes in the counties of East Tennessee, while four years later, in 1898, when the elections were held in each county by a board composed of two Democrats and one Republican, the Hon. James Fowler, an equally able and popular candidate, only received 39,444 votes. Both elections were held in off years when no president was voted for, and nobody ever contended that Mr. Fowler did not receive the vote of his party, or have counted for him every vote cast for him. No, my fellow citizens, the trouble with our Republican friends is that these laws have prevented them from stealing elections in East Tennessee, and there is where the shoe pinches.

Does that party favor fair, non-partisan and honest election laws, and can it be trusted to write an election law for the people of Tennessee? Let us examine its record for a moment. When the Democratic party came into power in 1870, they did not find the law empowering sheriffs to appoint election officers on the statute books. Oh, no! They found there these laws which I shall read to you, and they were the last laws passed by the Republican party on the subject of elections in Tennessee:

"That the governor of the State shall within sixty days after the passage of this act, appoint a commission of registration for each and every county in the State, who shall keep his office at the county seat of the county, and it shall be his duty to register the names of each and every qualified voter, and to issue a certificate that such voter is entitled to the privileges of the election franchise."

And not content with that, the Republican party waited one more year and then placed this election law upon the statute books:

"It shall be the duty of the commissioner of registration of voters to hold all elections now required by law to be held by sheriffs, and that for that purpose he shall have all the powers and rights that sheriffs now possess."

"The judges and clerks of all elections shall hereafter be selected and appointed by the commissioner of registration in each county in the State."

"That the governor of the State be authorized, and is hereby fully empowered, to set aside the registration of any county in this State, or any part thereof of said registration, where it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the governor, that frauds and irregularities have intervened in the registration of voters in such county. The governor shall make known such fact, and set aside said part, or whole of said registration, where frauds are shown to have been committed, by proclamation."—Sec. 1, Acts of 1867-8, page 63.)

That is not all. Does that party stand for liberty and for honest and constitutional government at home, when it has gone across the waters and conquered a helpless people by the sword and denies them the right of suffrage, and governs them with arbitrary power and without even the protecting shield of the constitution or the right of trial by jury?

Nor is that all. The recent platform of the Republican party proposes to invade Tennessee and the South, and if we do not throw away the safeguards and restraints from around the ballot box and let ignorance and vice rule us, they propose to

take from us a part of our vote and voice in the electoral college and make it impossible to ever dislodge them from power.

Upon that platform my competitor stands, and in one breath he asks the suffrages of the people of Tennessee, and in the next he endorses and approves the purpose of his party to steal from them their constitutional representation in the congress of the United States. For nearly forty years the men of the South have struggled with patience and fortitude to settle in peace and justice the race question, to them the most stupendous problem in the domestic life of the republic, and now comes Mr. Roosevelt, the Republican candidate for president, whom my competitor endorses and for whom he asks the electoral vote of Tennessee, and by his action and that of his party, he opens again that old wound, to the infinite injury of Tennessee and the South. It was made for partisan and selfish purposes and to make sure of the negro vote in those States where it is the balance of power. The issue is made and made by the Republican party Roosevelt and Littleton stand upon the same platform and advocate the same policies. Shall the South control its own affairs? Shall this be a white man's government, or shall it not? I leave it to the intelligence and manhood of Tennessee to say.

My competitor criticizes everything, but proposes nothing. What affirmative measure does he propose or policy advocate? Not one. This is a policy of retrogression, a policy of retreat. He wants to go backward, not forward. He would tear down, not build up. He stands committed in his opening speech against every forward movement, which has had for its purpose the moral and intellectual uplifting of the people and the material advancement of the State. He would repeal the uniform text book law and cripple the schools and leave the children to the unrestrained extortions of the book concerns in every county in the State. He would abolish the agricultural department and leave the farmers to the unprotected greed of the fertilizer companies. He would repeal the election laws and again open the doors to fraud and corruption. He would abolish the railroad commission, which, by its assessments, brings \$851,000 in taxes to help run the governments—State, county and municipal—and would leave the railroads unprotected to regulate their own freight rates, and if they wished, to extort on the people. He would cripple the penitentiary, which yields a profit of nearly \$200,000 a year to the State, by taking from it its business managers. All these things and more he would tear down, and yet he offers nothing to take their places.

No, my fellow citizens, Tennesseans are a progressive people. They never go backwards. Under Democratic government the old "Volunteer" State is standing on high and solid ground and looking to the future with hope and confidence. Under Democratic government its institutions have prospered, its resources have been developed and its wealth been many times multiplied. The assessed value of its property has risen from \$249,199,000 in 1882, the last year of Republican rule, to \$408,711,000 in 1902, or an increase of 64 per cent. in twenty years. Follow Democrats, with such a record for our party in the past, we cannot afford to waver in Tennessee this year. The hope of national victory was never brighter, the need of Democratic success was never greater. The plain and simple republic of the fathers, under Republican rule, by warring and overriding the constitution, is being transformed into a government of unlimited if not tyrannical powers. We are drifting from the paths of peace which we have traveled with honor and glory to the ways of war with the swagger of the bully. We are spending more than \$200,000,000 a year for military purposes in times of profound peace. We have gone across the waters 7,600 miles from our shores, and there conquered a helpless people and are governing them by arbitrary power, as a monarch would govern his subjects, without even the protection of the constitution or the right of trial by jury. We are levying taxes on them without their consent and governing them as subjects, not as citizens. This great republic, which was built upon the cornerstone that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," under the domination of ambitious men in the Republican party, has abandoned this principle, which is the ark of the people's safety, and is now assuming to govern people as colonies, outside of the constitution, after the manner of the kingdoms and empires of the Old World. Let me admonish you, my countrymen, of all parties, that the only safe and sure way to preserve our own liberties unimpared is to keep this republic along the time and within the constitutional limitations.

Against the reckless, erratic, scuttling rough rider, the Democratic party presents a plain farmer, a learned judge, an honest, brave and conservative statesman, the Hon. Alton B. Parker of New York. A man who would respect and enforce the law and not violate the constitution he was sworn to uphold. Elect Roosevelt and no man can predict what the future will be. Elect Parker and he will bring the republic back to its ancient moorings and steer it safely along the way marked out by the fathers. Then let me admonish you to be steadfast in the faith, and as long as human liberty and constitutional government shall abide in this great republic, the Democratic party shall live to exemplify the one and defend the other.